



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 20

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 28: What is the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb concerning this matter and where does he stand with respect to the tafseel of the Salaf?

It is important to remember here the well-known principle that a man can have in him Imaan and Kufr (the minor kufr), and Tawheed and Shirk (the minor shirk), Ikhlaas and Nifaaq (minor nifaaq), Sunnah and Bid'ah, Taqwaa and Fujoor and so on – and alongside all of that he is a Muslim and Believer (to the extent of what he has with him of Tawheed, Imaan, Sunnah, Ikhlaas, Taqwaa and so on).

And the act of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed (as has preceded above) is from the minor kufr, and only becomes major kufr in certain situations and conditions. It is for this reason we see the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas and his associates (and the whole of the Ummah) thereafter, of the verses related to rulership in al-Maa'idah, explaining them to be in reference to the minor kufr. And so the presence of this minor kufr does not negate the basis of Imaan. This is what Ibn al-Qayyim referred to as the "Tafseel of the Sahaabah" (in his Kitaab us-Salaat, as has preceded), and Shaikh ul-Islaam, in his book Kitaab ul-Imaan also explains this point by quoting the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas and his associates on numerous occasions. Hence, a believer could have a mixture of Imaan and Kufr (minor kufr).

The aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb necessitates that in the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, there is only Imaan **OR** Kufr, and no in-between state. This is based upon his extremist exaggeration of the meaning of the kalimah, that it is essentially haakimiyyah – that is that the Kalimah means Allaah is the only true judge and lawmaker. This extremism led him to the "All or Nothing" syndrome which his writings are replete with. And this "All or Nothing" syndrome was applied to both those who rule and those who are ruled over. And the end result of this type of absolution is the madhhab of the Khawaarij.

Stated the sayyid of the Qutubists, “Certainly, the [underlying] issue in all of this is the issue of [either] Imaan or kufr, Islaam or Jaahiliyyah, and the legislation or the desire. **And certainly there is no in-between state in this affair.** There is no truce or any treaty (in this affair)! The believers are those who judge by what Allaah has revealed – they do not distort a single letter from it, and nor do they replace any of it whatsoever. And the disbelievers, the oppressors and sinners, they are the ones who do not judge by what Allaah has revealed. Either the rulers are upholding the Sharee’ah **in its complete entirety (kaamilatan)**, and hence they are within the confines of Imaan, or they are upholding other legislations, those for which Allaah has not given any authority. Hence, they are disbelievers, oppressors, and sinners. And either the people [those ruled over] accept the law and decision of Allaah from the rulers and judges in their affairs, so that they are believers ... and if not then they are not believers. **And there is no middle path between this path or that path, and nor is there any evidence and nor is there any excuse (ma’dhirah)** and nor any seeking to use the excuse of an attainable benefit (maslahah)...” (az-Zilaal 2/887-888)

He also stated, completing his thought and ideology, “Certainly, the one who obeys a person in regard to a legislation that he has [devised] himself, even if it was in a very minute matter (juz’iyyah sagheerah), then he is a pagan (Mushrik). And if he was a Muslim originally and then did this (obeyed someone in other than the Sharee’ah), then he has left Islaam and entered into Shirk as well... regardless of whether he continues to repeat “Laa ilaaha illallaaha” with this tongue after that – the while he takes from other than Allaah and obeys other than Allaah.” (az-Zilaal 3/1198).

He also says: “The time has reverted back to its original form on the very day this religion can to mankind with the phrase “Laa ilaaha illallaaha”. For mankind has apostatised and gone to the worship of the servants, and to the oppression of the various religions and it has fled from “Laa ilaaha illallaaha”. [This is so] even though a party from amongst them repeat “Laa ilaaha illallaaha” from the minarets, without understanding its meaning and without intending this particular meaning when they repeat it, and without rejecting the Sharee’ah of al-Haakimiyyah that the servants have claimed for themselves.” (az-Zilaal 2/1057)

These types of themes are abundant in Sayyid Qutb’s works, especially Milestones (Ma’aalim Fit-Tareeq) and also his Tafsir (Fee Dhilaal il-Qur’aan). The essence of the matter is that Sayyid Qutb entered extremism into this particular issue, which over the decades would lead to the gradual erosion of the tafseel of the Salaf – as the Qutubi, Ikhwaani, Takfiri da’wah made inroads into Ahl us-Sunnah – and the gradual inception of the absolution and generalisation of Sayyid Qutb. At his time and after his death Sayyid Qutb was actually refuted by a lot of the scholars of Egypt for his extremism and Ikhwanite figureheads also noted his extremism thereafter.

Fareed Abdul-Khaliq (one of the former Murshids of Ikhwaan): “We have pointed out in what has preceded that the spread of the ideology of takfir occurred amongst the youth of the Ikhwaan who were imprisoned in the late fifties and early sixties, **and that they**

were influenced by the ideology of the Shaheed¹ Sayyid Qutb and his writings. They derived from these writings that the society had fallen into Jahiliyyah (of kufr), and that he had performed takfir of the rulers who had rejected the Hakimiyyah of Allaah by not ruling by what Allaah has revealed, and also takfir of those ruled over (i.e. civilians), when they became satisfied with this.” (Ikhwan ul-Muslimoon Fee Mizanil-Haqq’ p.115)

Pay very close attention to the following:

Sayyid Qutb stated in az-Zilaal (3/1492), “As for those idols about which it is known that they (the pagans) used to worship, then never was their worship of them built upon the belief that those idols had (the right of) Uloohiyyah, like the Uloohiyyah of Allaah – free is he of imperfection. And the Noble Qur’an has explained the reality of their ideological belief regarding these idols and their reason for giving devotion to them in His saying, the Most High, “And those who take Auliya’ (protectors and helpers) besides Him (say): ‘We worship them only that they may bring us near to Allâh.’” (Zumar 39:3). So this was the extent of their belief and understanding with respect to these idols, that they were merely intercessors with Allaah. **And the reality of their Shirk was not from this angle.** (!!!) The Islaam of those who submitted (and became Muslim) was not exemplified by their mere abandonment of seeking these idols as intercessors, and if not then the Hunafaa who refrained from worshipping the idols and made their devotion for Allaah alone would be considered Muslims. (!) Islam is exemplified with belief (i’tiqad) and devotion (to Allaah) **and singling out Allaah – free from imperfection – with al-Haakimiyyah, in every era and place.** They are mushriks and their mere belief that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah and their mere devotion to Him alone (with the acts of ritual worship) **would not be sufficient to remove them from this Shirk**, for in this case they would merely be like the Hunafaa whom no one considered to be Muslims. People are only considered Muslims when they complete the rings of the chain, meaning when they add to their belief (in the kalimah) and their devoting the acts of worship to Allaah alone, the singling out of Allaah – free is He from imperfection – with al-Haakimiyyah, and their rejection of any legislation, or law, or rule, or principle, or following (taqleed) which did not come from Allaah alone. **This alone is Islaam because this alone is the true meaning of the testimony that “there is none that has the right to be worshipped except Allaah and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah”...**”

What he is stating here that testifying that none has the right to be worshipped except Allaah and acting upon the pillars (i.e. the ritual acts of worship etc.) is not sufficient for true and correct (i.e. valid) Islaam. Rather, only when al-Haakimiyyah (as Sayyid Qutb understands it) is added to that is a person considered to be a Muslim. Otherwise, he is nothing short of a Mushrik. And of course al-Haakimiyyah, to Sayyid Qutb, is that a ruler rules by all of what Allaah has revealed, and that any shortcoming in this regard is Shirk with Allaah in his Uloohiyyah.

¹ Stating “Shaheed” unrestrictedly is not permissible and is indicative of Irjaa’.

So this type of understanding led to absolution (itlaaq) and generalisation and a departure from the tafseel of the Salaf. It also affected and influenced people in different ways. To those who were nurtured upon the books of Sayyid Qutb – while ignorant of the Salafi aqeedah and manhaj, never having been introduced to it – they thought that the absolutions and generalisations of Sayyid Qutb were the actual truth and that this was the madhhab of Ahl us-Sunnah. In later times, in the 70s and 80s when the Ikhwan in general (who were upon the thought of Sayyid Qutb in the field of takfir and haakimiyyah) had more exposure to the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah, and came to realise the tafseel of the Salaf in this regard, they then introduced shubuhaat (similar to those that were covered earlier) and found many generalised and ambiguous statements to support these shubuhaat, statements from the scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah. They also attempted to explain away and discredit the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas, which the whole Ummah had taken with acceptance. In reality, the contention surrounding the concept of “the lesser kufr” (kufr doona kufr) came from the direction of Ikhwaan, chief amongst them Mohammad Qutb, who labelled this explanation as “madhloom Ibn 'Abbaas” – what exactly he meant by this, then Allaah knows best.

As for those who were actually upon the tafseel of the Salaf but then got poisoned by the teachings of Sayyid Qutb and Mohammad Qutb, then they shifted towards the absolution (itlaaq) of Sayyid Qutb. This saw their subsequent attachment to some of the statements of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and also the two Shakir brothers on this issue. They then drew upon many of the ambiguous and general words of the scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah in this regard, and used them in order to centre their discussions around the topics of tabdeel and istibdaal and the likes and to then claim an Ijmaa' on the kufr of the one “replaces” the Sharee'ah, without actually clarifying what they actually mean, or what is actually meant by tabdeel, istibdaal and the likes. Because the likes of these people were Salafi in their background, this caused a lot of confusion for others, because they drew upon the ambiguous words of the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah, in order to express their new found orientation in manhaj, which was in reality, the extremism of Sayyid Qutb in Haakimiyyah.

This phenomena was clearly observed by the attachment of these people to some of the statements of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, and also Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen (who actually had many other statements which clarified his general statements) and others. People who got affected in this manner included the neo-Qutubiyyah of Saudi Arabia, like Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah, Nasir al-'Umar and others who were poisoned by Mohammad Qutb. And similarly those in the west who got poisoned by these ones include the likes of Ali at-Timimi, who prior to 1995 would clearly state the tafseel of the Salaf and apply it to the rulers who judge by the secular laws of the British and French, and would never talk of the tabdeel and istibdaal and the great ambiguities surrounding these affairs (refer to MNJ050018, GRV070016 for more details), and then lo and behold, after 1997, he then came out with all of these shubuhaat and then began speaking of the extremist manhaj of Sayyid Qutb on al-Haakimiyyah and also he began speaking of the same shubuhaat that we have covered in earlier questions.

In addition many of those who were originally outright Takfiri and Khariji and only held their views on this topic based upon what they had learnt from the Ikhwanite figureheads like Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb and Abdullaah Azzaam and others - they then found new support for their views, when they came to learn of the statements of the likes of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, Imaam ash-Shanqeetee and Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Ibn Baaz, all of which were either ambiguous and general and clarified elsewhere with tafseel, or were in relation to total istibdaal. So they jumped upon these statements and the shubuhaat that were built upon them, and then utilised them to make takfeer of the rulers who judge by the secular laws (in greater or lesser amounts), without tafseel. And in their great ignorance of the true state of affairs and the realities in this issue, they thought that they were upon manifest guidance.

Prior to the entrance of this fitnah, the issue of replacement of the Sharee'ah was not really a point of dispute, despite the fact that the sayings of the Scholars were in existence. However, when the Qutubiyyah made their open da'wah – which was a well-defined da'wah, being taken from the doctrines of Sayyid Qutb and Hasan al-Bannaa, and because some of those who called to this da'wah had been nurtured in a Sunni environment (i.e. Hawali, Awdah etc.) they then gathered and compiled the statements of those scholars which would support their manhaj in general. Notice we say, “support their manhaj in general” and not “support their particular viewpoint (on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed”. This is because although the views of some of our scholars gave support to their viewpoint on a particular matter, the manhaj of our scholars was altogether different to the actual manhaj that these Qutubiyyah were upon, and which they sought to promote by scavenging upon the words of our scholars². So the issue was not

² BETWEEN THE QUTUBIYYAH AND THE SHAIKHS OF AD-DA'WAH AS-SALAFIYYAH

The First Position

There are those who hold the view that judging by the secular laws, in place of the Sharee'ah laws in the majority of matters is major kufr – and at the same time, they refute Sayyid Qutb and his heresies and declare him a Jaahil who uttered kufr and apostasy. They enjoin obedience to the Rulers, declare Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah to be an innovation and misguidance, and warn from takfir of rulers and nation states, warn against open rejection upon the pulpits, and also refute those who deviate in the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and who are upon the manhaj of Qutb and Bannaa. Indeed this is the likes of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and others.

The Second Position

Then there are those who hold the view that judging by the secular laws, in place of the Sharee'ah laws in the majority of matters is not major kufr absolutely and is to be carried upon the tafseel of the Salaf – and at the same time, they refute Sayyid Qutb and his heresies and declare him a Jaahil who uttered kufr and apostasy. They enjoin obedience to the Rulers, declare Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah to be an innovation and misguidance, and warn from takfir of rulers and nation states, warn against open rejection upon the pulpits, and also refute those who deviate in the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and who are upon the manhaj of Qutb and Bannaa. Indeed this is the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani, Shaikh Abdul-Muhsin al'Abbaad, then those who follow their view, such as al-'Anbari and al-Halabi and others.

And so they differ with each other, on this one issue (of the ruling on judging by the secular laws in place of the Sharee'ah), while being united upon the rest.

The Third Well-Defined Orientation

just “an academic discussion of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed” and who is right or who is wrong. Rather, it extended to much more than that and entered into the fields of the manhaj of da’wah, rectification of the Muslim societies, issues related to takfir and khurooj, and all of the other many issues that we have outlined elsewhere.

This is why, as we mentioned earlier, that the da’wah of the neo-Qutubiyah, in recent times, during the Gulf War and after it, allowed the outright Khawaarij and Takfiris to enter into the da’wah of Ahl us-Sunnah and to cause great confusion amongst their ranks – whereas previously, their situation was very clear to Ahl us-Sunnah.

Then there are the Charlatans, Biased Partisans, neo-Qutubites, born of the Awakening of Qutubism and who upon the manhaj of those declared “The Khawaarij of the Era” by Imaam al-Albaani who monopolise upon this difference between OUR scholars, while they praise and aggrandise the Innovators, declaring them “Shaheeds” and “Imaams of Guidance”, and who make Takfir ‘alal-Itlaaq, secretly promote the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Banna, who have deviated in the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, innovated into the matter of Tawheed, innovated Shurocracy, adopted the methods of the Infidels in their da’wah (revolutions, open demonstrations, rallies), and made the focus of da’wah to be shifted from what the Prophets were upon to field and arena of the Kharijites – of takfir and haakimiyyah and khurooj. They remain silent upon the Innovators, make walaa and baraa for their sake, while showing the greatest of enmity towards the Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah, and striving the utmost to accuse them with the Irjaa of Jahm Ibn Safwaan.

These Neo-Qutubites (like Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah and others), adopted the madhhab of Sayyid Qutb, and then called to it, nurtured the youth upon it, and then removed the fine line that used to exist between the Salafis and the outright Khawaarij and Takfiris. So these Takfiris and Khawaarij entered into the da’wah, and then, whereas before they would make takfir ‘alal-itlaaq based upon a nullification of the tafseer of Ibn ‘Abbaas and speak with the apparent and absolute meanings of the verses in al-Maa’idah and an-Nisaa’ – just like the Khawaarij of old, they then began to play upon the concepts of tabdeel, istibdaal, tashree’ etc. to further support their manhaj – using some of the words of OUR scholars for that.

We see them, and we know them, and their signs, and their distinguishing characteristics, and their hijacking of the da’wah!

And if they really wish to truly make Allaah’s word supreme, then let them free themselves from the Raafidee Heretics, and the Soofee Innovators, around whose beliefs and teachings, their whole manhaj of Extremist Takfir and Haakimiyyah and Irjaa’ towards the Innovators is based!!